



Re: Venice BID close-to-final...

1 message

Thu, Oct 29, 2015 at 12:08 PM

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

I've had a chance to review. Thanks for the work you did. I was a little thrown at first, but once I realized it was all done from the 10.13 version rather than the 10.22 version it made sense (and which seems fine from a data standpoint since the only numerical changes were the "Dennis corrections.") Sorry you had to redo the "Dennis corrections," and thank you. They weren't in the 10.13 :)

So my assessment of what's left is this (**please let me know if I missed anything**)

- a bit of cleanup to do (formatting) and
- the public parcels tab is out-of-date (I re-did it for the 10.22 version per feedback from Miranda on the MDP/tables.) I should just be able to swap out the 10.13 Public Parcels tab and replace it with the 10.22 Public Parcels tab (but will make sure everything still works properly.) Most of that tab (unlike the others) is static, so it should be simple.
- I need to fix the assessment source tables (the green table on bottom of the main tab and also Tab 5, which is the same table but in a format we use in the MDP) to gel with the new columns you created.

Otherwise, I think everything looks good and I should have it back to you this afternoon. None of the changes above will affect assessments or any core data.

On Wed, Oct 28, 2015 at 2:59 PM, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:

Hi Tara,

I finally got through this. I got hung up because the total assessment was not matching, until I realized the version of the database I started working from did not contain the "Dennis corrections" from last week.

In the interest of minimizing confusion, I've started a new string rather than replying to your last e-mail, I have retained the numbering of the issues from that e-mail (October 22).

1- OK

2- OK

3, 4, 5- These tie in with the issue you raised starting with the unnumbered "Lastly". Please see columns AP, AX, and BE in the attached Excel file (ending with "...GY changes) for this discussion. What I've done is to place the adjustments in sand and marketing in the columns marked B-adj-final, F-adj-final, and L-adj-final. They are static columns. Obviously, I modified the assessment calculation column (BJ) to read from these columns. This way, you can pull from here for whatever you need for the MDP while still retaining the original dimensions in the base-data columns. I'm guessing we'll be talking about this, so please feel free to call.

6- OK

7- OK (but the red is back, you can get rid of it when you're done; I needed it to focus on this LAUSD parcel's uniqueness)

--

Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621



Re: Venice BID close-to-final...

1 message

Thu, Oct 29, 2015 at 3:10 PM

Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

All that seems correct.
I have focused on the main database, not the feeds from it which I'll check once the basics are definitively in place.
I'm out tomorrow, so I'll see whatever you send on Monday.
Have a good weekend.

G

On Thu, Oct 29, 2015 at 12:08 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

I've had a chance to review. Thanks for the work you did. I was a little thrown at first, but once I realized it was all done from the 10.13 version rather than the 10.22 version it made sense (and which seems fine from a data standpoint since the only numerical changes were the "Dennis corrections.") Sorry you had to redo the "Dennis corrections," and thank you. They weren't in the 10.13 :)

So my assessment of what's left is this (**please let me know if I missed anything**)

- a bit of cleanup to do (formatting) and
- the public parcels tab is out-of-date (I re-did it for the 10.22 version per feedback from Miranda on the MDP/tables.) I should just be able to swap out the 10.13 Public Parcels tab and replace it with the 10.22 Public Parcels tab (but will make sure everything still works properly.) Most of that tab (unlike the others) is static, so it should be simple.
- I need to fix the assessment source tables (the green table on bottom of the main tab and also Tab 5, which is the same table but in a format we use in the MDP) to gel with the new columns you created.

Otherwise, I think everything looks good and I should have it back to you this afternoon. None of the changes above will affect assessments or any core data.

On Wed, Oct 28, 2015 at 2:59 PM, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:

Hi Tara,

I finally got through this. I got hung up because the total assessment was not matching, until I realized the version of the database I started working from did not contain the "Dennis corrections" from last week.

In the interest of minimizing confusion, I've started a new string rather than replying to your last e-mail, I have retained the numbering of the issues from that e-mail (October 22).

1- OK

2- OK

3, 4, 5- These tie in with the issue you raised starting with the unnumbered "Lastly". Please see columns AP, AX, and BE in the attached Excel file (ending with "...GY changes) for this discussion. What I've done is to place the adjustments in sand and marketing in the columns marked B-adj-final, F-adj-final, and L-adj-final. They are static columns. Obviously, I modified the assessment calculation column (BJ) to read from these columns. This way, you can pull from here for whatever you need for the MDP while still retaining the original dimensions in the base-data columns. I'm guessing we'll be talking about this, so please feel free to call.

6- OK

7- OK (but the red is back, you can get rid of it when you're done; I needed it to focus on this LAUSD parcel's uniqueness)

--

Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621



Re: Venice BID close-to-final...

1 message

Thu, Oct 29, 2015 at 3:41 PM

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

It's all complete. New database is attached.

There are no changes to any data, just formatting cleanup and repair on two tables whose references were thrown off by the columns you added. I've triple-checked the tables and all are fine.
FYI, we only use tabs #2, 3, 4 and 5 in the MDP (there are some other old tabs in there that reflect past, static work.)

I really, really need to move forward with the next MDP/ER draft, so I am shipping this to Ed tonight after I update my MDP tables. I wish I could wait until Monday, but both Ed and I work weekends when we're busy. We've got increasingly dangerous and violent events unfolding each month in Venice, so there is real urgency on this BID. LAPD, property owners and the council office are all very anxious for this effort to move forward, as the existing resources are not able to address the extent of the issues in the area.

I don't think you'll find any errors in the tables, but if you catch anything, let me know.

On Thu, Oct 29, 2015 at 3:10 PM, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:

All that seems correct.

I have focused on the main database, not the feeds from it which I'll check once the basics are definitively in place. I'm out tomorrow, so I'll see whatever you send on Monday.
Have a good weekend.

G

On Thu, Oct 29, 2015 at 12:08 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

I've had a chance to review. Thanks for the work you did. I was a little thrown at first, but once I realized it was all done from the 10.13 version rather than the 10.22 version it made sense (and which seems fine from a data standpoint since the only numerical changes were the "Dennis corrections.") Sorry you had to redo the "Dennis corrections," and thank you. They weren't in the 10.13 :)

So my assessment of what's left is this (**please let me know if I missed anything**)

- a bit of cleanup to do (formatting) and
- the public parcels tab is out-of-date (I re-did it for the 10.22 version per feedback from Miranda on the MDP/tables.) I should just be able to swap out the 10.13 Public Parcels tab and replace it with the 10.22 Public Parcels tab (but will make sure everything still works properly.) Most of that tab (unlike the others) is static, so it should be simple.
- I need to fix the assessment source tables (the green table on bottom of the main tab and also Tab 5, which is the same table but in a format we use in the MDP) to gel with the new columns you created.

Otherwise, I think everything looks good and I should have it back to you this afternoon. None of the changes above will affect assessments or any core data.

On Wed, Oct 28, 2015 at 2:59 PM, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:

Hi Tara,

I finally got through this. I got hung up because the total assessment was not matching, until I realized the version of the database I started working from did not contain the "Dennis corrections" from last week.

In the interest of minimizing confusion, I've started a new string rather than replying to your last e-mail, I have retained the numbering of the issues from that e-mail (October 22).

1- OK

2- OK

3, 4, 5- These tie in with the issue you raised starting with the unnumbered "Lastly". Please see columns AP, AX, and BE in the attached Excel file (ending with "...GY changes) for this discussion. What I've done is to place the adjustments in sand and marketing in the columns marked B-adj-final, F-adj-final, and L-adj-final. They are static columns. Obviously, I modified the assessment calculation column (BJ) to read from these columns. This way, you can pull from here for whatever you need for the MDP while still retaining the original dimensions in the base-data columns. I'm guessing we'll be talking about this, so please feel free to call.

6- OK

7- OK (but the red is back, you can get rid of it when you're done; I needed it to focus on this LAUSD parcel's uniqueness)

--

Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--

Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621



2015.10.29 Venice database submitted to City - corresponds to the 2nd draft of MDP & ER.xlsx
262K



Re: Venice BID close-to-final...

1 message

Thu, Oct 29, 2015 at 3:50 PM

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

P.S. One note: Tab #4 is incomplete right now; Ed does this one as part of the ER. It is the Assessment & Non-Assessment Revenue tab, which shows the "general benefit" revenue as separate from the assessment revenue.

So when we submit the next draft of the MDP and ER, I will again submit the dbase, and at that time, that table will be complete. The only thing that will change is that table.

On Thu, Oct 29, 2015 at 3:41 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
It's all complete. New database is attached.

There are no changes to any data, just formatting cleanup and repair on two tables whose references were thrown off by the columns you added. I've triple-checked the tables and all are fine.
FYI, we only use tabs #2, 3, 4 and 5 in the MDP (there are some other old tabs in there that reflect past, static work.)

I really, really need to move forward with the next MDP/ER draft, so I am shipping this to Ed tonight after I update my MDP tables. I wish I could wait until Monday, but both Ed and I work weekends when we're busy. We've got increasingly dangerous and violent events unfolding each month in Venice, so there is real urgency on this BID. LAPD, property owners and the council office are all very anxious for this effort to move forward, as the existing resources are not able to address the extent of the issues in the area.

I don't think you'll find any errors in the tables, but if you catch anything, let me know.

On Thu, Oct 29, 2015 at 3:10 PM, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
All that seems correct.
I have focused on the main database, not the feeds from it which I'll check once the basics are definitively in place. I'm out tomorrow, so I'll see whatever you send on Monday.
Have a good weekend.

G

On Thu, Oct 29, 2015 at 12:08 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
I've had a chance to review. Thanks for the work you did. I was a little thrown at first, but once I realized it was all done from the 10.13 version rather than the 10.22 version it made sense (and which seems fine from a data standpoint since the only numerical changes were the "Dennis corrections.") Sorry you had to redo the "Dennis corrections," and thank you. They weren't in the 10.13 :)

So my assessment of what's left is this (**please let me know if I missed anything**)

- a bit of cleanup to do (formatting) and
- the public parcels tab is out-of-date (I re-did it for the 10.22 version per feedback from Miranda on the MDP/tables.) I should just be able to swap out the 10.13 Public Parcels tab and replace it with the 10.22 Public Parcels tab (but will make sure everything still works properly.) Most of that tab (unlike the others) is static, so it should be simple.
- I need to fix the assessment source tables (the green table on bottom of the main tab and also Tab 5, which is the same table but in a format we use in the MDP) to gel with the new columns you created.

Otherwise, I think everything looks good and I should have it back to you this afternoon. None of the changes above will affect assessments or any core data.

On Wed, Oct 28, 2015 at 2:59 PM, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
Hi Tara,

I finally got through this. I got hung up because the total assessment was not matching, until I realized the version of the database I started working from did not contain the "Dennis corrections" from last week.

In the interest of minimizing confusion, I've started a new string rather than replying to your last e-mail, I have retained the numbering of the issues from that e-mail (October 22).

1- OK

2- OK

3, 4, 5- These tie in with the issue you raised starting with the unnumbered "Lastly". Please see columns AP, AX, and BE in the attached Excel file (ending with "...GY changes) for this discussion. What I've done is to place the adjustments in sand and marketing in the columns marked B-adj-final, F-adj-final, and L-adj-final. They are static columns. Obviously, I modified the assessment calculation column (BJ) to read from these columns. This way, you can pull from here for whatever you need for the MDP while still retaining the original dimensions in the base-data columns. I'm guessing we'll be talking about this, so please feel free to call.

6- OK

7- OK (but the red is back, you can get rid of it when you're done; I needed it to focus on this LAUSD parcel's uniqueness)

--

Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--

Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621



Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Re: Venice BID close-to-final...

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Thu, Oct 29, 2015 at 3:50 PM

P.S. One note: Tab #4 is incomplete right now; Ed does this one as part of the ER. It is the Assessment & Non-Assessment Revenue tab, which shows the "general benefit" revenue as separate from the assessment revenue.

So when we submit the next draft of the MDP and ER, I will again submit the dbase, and at that time, that table will be complete. The only thing that will change is that table.

On Thu, Oct 29, 2015 at 3:41 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
It's all complete. New database is attached.

There are no changes to any data, just formatting cleanup and repair on two tables whose references were thrown off by the columns you added. I've triple-checked the tables and all are fine.
FYI, we only use tabs #2, 3, 4 and 5 in the MDP (there are some other old tabs in there that reflect past, static work.)

I really, really need to move forward with the next MDP/ER draft, so I am shipping this to Ed tonight after I update my MDP tables. I wish I could wait until Monday, but both Ed and I work weekends when we're busy. We've got increasingly dangerous and violent events unfolding each month in Venice, so there is real urgency on this BID. LAPD, property owners and the council office are all very anxious for this effort to move forward, as the existing resources are not able to address the extent of the issues in the area.

I don't think you'll find any errors in the tables, but if you catch anything, let me know.

On Thu, Oct 29, 2015 at 3:10 PM, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
All that seems correct.

I have focused on the main database, not the feeds from it which I'll check once the basics are definitively in place. I'm out tomorrow, so I'll see whatever you send on Monday.
Have a good weekend.

G

On Thu, Oct 29, 2015 at 12:08 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

I've had a chance to review. Thanks for the work you did. I was a little thrown at first, but once I realized it was all done from the 10.13 version rather than the 10.22 version it made sense (and which seems fine from a data standpoint since the only numerical changes were the "Dennis corrections.") Sorry you had to redo the "Dennis corrections," and thank you. They weren't in the 10.13 :)

So my assessment of what's left is this (**please let me know if I missed anything**)

- a bit of cleanup to do (formatting) and
- the public parcels tab is out-of-date (I re-did it for the 10.22 version per feedback from Miranda on the MDP/tables.) I should just be able to swap out the 10.13 Public Parcels tab and replace it with the 10.22 Public Parcels tab (but will make sure everything still works properly.) Most of that tab (unlike the others) is static, so it should be simple.
- I need to fix the assessment source tables (the green table on bottom of the main tab and also Tab 5, which is the same table but in a format we use in the MDP) to gel with the new columns you created.

Otherwise, I think everything looks good and I should have it back to you this afternoon. None of the changes above will affect assessments or any core data.

On Wed, Oct 28, 2015 at 2:59 PM, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
Hi Tara,

I finally got through this. I got hung up because the total assessment was not matching, until I realized the version of the database I started working from did not contain the "Dennis corrections" from last week.

In the interest of minimizing confusion, I've started a new string rather than replying to your last e-mail, I have retained the numbering of the issues from that e-mail (October 22).

1- OK

2- OK

3, 4, 5- These tie in with the issue you raised starting with the unnumbered "Lastly". Please see columns AP, AX, and BE in the attached Excel file (ending with "...GY changes) for this discussion. What I've done is to place the adjustments in sand and marketing in the columns marked B-adj-final, F-adj-final, and L-adj-final. They are static columns. Obviously, I modified the assessment calculation column (BJ) to read from these columns. This way, you can pull from here for whatever you need for the MDP while still retaining the original dimensions in the base-data columns. I'm guessing we'll be talking about this, so please feel free to call.

6- OK

7- OK (but the red is back, you can get rid of it when you're done; I needed it to focus on this LAUSD parcel's uniqueness)

--

Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--

Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621